



Our Ref: ep325/let003/DS

09th February 2012

Aberdeen City Council
City Development Services
Planning Department
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen AB10 1AB

Dear Sirs

PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE NUMBER – 120048

APPLICANT – FIRST CONSTRUCTION LIMITED

PROPOSAL – Proposed urban village (mixed development) including: major restoration and conversion of important Listed Buildings formerly used as a textile mill; demolition of various industrial premises; construction of new build developments comprising 517 flats (of which 175 are conversions); 4525m² of non-residential uses including a notional 1975m² of ground floor retail; 1900m² of storage; a 450m² nursery and a 200m² restaurant; 579 surface and basement car parking spaces and associated engineering and infrastructure works at the former Broadford Works, Maberly Street, Aberdeen

We write on behalf of our client Mr Graeme Thain who is the owner of residential properties at 12 Maberly Street and 8 Kingsland Place, Aberdeen (residing in the former) in connection with the above-mentioned planning application which has recently been submitted to your Council by Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of First Construction Limited. Whilst our client welcomes the principle of the site being re-developed for the purposes proposed he has considerable concerns about the relationship of some of the proposals to his properties at Maberly Street and Kingsland Place.

He is particularly concerned and justifiably so with the positioning of Block J which is proposed immediately to the west of the private garden space serving his dwelling house at 12 Maberly Street. Although the garden in question is situated at the front of the house it is enclosed by a wall thus offering high levels of personal privacy and valuable amenity space particularly in the summer. The positioning of Block J which is four storeys in height along the boundary of our client's property will result in a reduction in sunlight to the garden and a significant element of overshadowing to the ultimate detriment of residential amenity. In the circumstances outlined it is respectfully suggested that Block J be removed from the scheme in the interests of our client's amenity unless the applicants, through the submission of a detailed overshadowing analysis, demonstrate beyond all unreasonable doubt that no such over-shadowing or loss of sunlight would occur.

Our client would also at this stage wish to express concerns about the respective heights of Blocks G and H which are considered to be entirely overbearing, resulting in a significant loss to the residential amenity of both properties.

We would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of these objections at your earliest convenience and thank you in anticipation for your assistance.

Yours faithfully,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Derek Scott.

Derek Scott

cc: G Thain

From : webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
To : pi@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Date : 20/01/2012 21:15
Subject : Planning Comment for 120048

Comment for Planning Application 120048

Name : Arthur Wylie
Address : 40 Maberly Street
Aberdeen
AB25 1NB

Telephone:

Email:

Type:

Comment: I cannot see how there could be a vehicle access into the site using the old car park entrance near the bottom of Maberly Street. The road is very narrow and any such access would be dangerous.

When this site first came up for a Planning Application I suggested that an industrial museum be included on the site. I later heard that part of the old granite mill was earmarked for this. There is no mention of a museum in the new plans. What has happened?

I fully agree that the old hosepipe lining towers be made available for the public for viewing platforms. I also suggested this. I would be in favour of the new housing blocks to be named after well known managers or directors of Richards Ltd eg Hitchen Court, Taylor House etc

Aberdeen City Council
City Development Services
St Nicholas House
Broad Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1BW

Andy Pratt
Penthouse South
The Bastille
Maberly Street
Aberdeen
AB25 1NL

21st January 2012

Dear Sirs

Proposed Development at Broadford Works

Having never felt valid necessity to pass comment on a previous application to which I am entitled I regret that this is not the case with the proposed development at Broadford Works.

The main area of concern is the car parking and the 'justification' for the developer not adhering to the ACC Inner City Parking Standards.

Are these standards not there for a reason? Is it acceptable to ignore the Council?

The Bastille has 50+ internal spaces and 20+ external for the 53 flats in the building and they are mostly all full at nights with people putting adverts on the notice board to rent additional ones.

As this is a similar development within the same area and I imagine aimed at people with similar disposable income, how can the developer claim that only 50% of people who will buy/rent these new flats will have cars?

I am not sure of the extent of the Berryden car ownership survey but feel that it may include a lot of student accommodation so is not representative of the requirement for the development.

They make no assessment or allowance for delivery vehicles, tradesmen or visitors.

Please remember that it is not just illegal parking that may result as there are already residents in the area who only have on street parking. Try looking around for spare capacity at the present time, it is not fair to them.

The capacity of adjoining roads also needs to be considered for this volume of traffic. By living on Maberly Street I have seen the difficulties encountered by HGV vehicles as it was never designed for them and there are to be 3 additional exits onto this road, even with the current traffic and volume there are numerous 'near miss' incidents especially on the 'semi blind' corner which people drive around far too quickly.

I would request your serious consideration before **any** approvals are granted for this as what could result in a tasteful and beneficial development within our town centre may well turn into a problem area for residents and police long after the developers have spent the proceeds.

Yours Faithfully

Andy Pratt

From : webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
To : pi@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Date : 1/25/2012 9:10pm
Subject : Planning Comment for 120048

Comment for Planning Application 120048

Name : Michelle Wylie
Address : 40 Maberly Street
Aberdeen
AB25 1NB

Telephone:

Email:

Type:

Comment: As a resident living near the site of the proposed development, I am fed up of seeing it being left to decay and attracting those who engage in anti-social behaviour such as fire raising and alleged drug taking. This is an important site of industrial heritage and therefore any development of the site has to be done in such a way that the importance of the site is taken into consideration.

The proposals that have been submitted have the potential to do just this. The proposal of turning the granite office building into a small hotel rather than a bar/restaurant, in my opinion, is a much more sensible idea. It may still have a public bar but within a hotel, it shouldn't impact on the business of the nearby Charlotte and Northern Bars. Not only that but it'll provide visitors to the city with accommodation near the site if they so wish to visit it.

I still think that the Grey Mill should be converted into a museum of industrial heritage as I hear it still has the old machinery intact. This machinery is something which should not be thrown away but preserved for future generations to understand the history of the site. For years Dundee has had the Verdant Mills which are a major tourist attraction. This is a possible use for the Grey Mill and it could be possible to have guides employed at such a facility to not only explain the history but also to learn how to operate the machinery and demonstrate how it works to visitors. If there is room on the site, it could also house interactive displays as this is something that museum visitors today want out of their visit.

The use of the hosepipe towers as a viewing post is a fantastic idea that would be popular with both visitors and residents alike. A charge is likely to be levied for this but the money raised could go towards maintenance. This is something Aberdeen doesn't really have, other than the Grampian Eye beside the beach, and would increase footfall into the area which would in turn create vibrancy in the area and attract more business to the surrounding shops, restaurants and bars. Aberdeen needs to have the facilities in place to position itself as a successful tourist city in the future and having attractions visitors want and residents can use is vital to this.

There should be some affordable housing on this site as in the current economic climate, many people are finding it hard to get mortgages and therefore don't have the money to buy accommodation at any price. If families are to be attracted in to use the proposed nursery and playpark facilities, they need accommodation they can afford within the city centre. Low paid workers earning less than £30,000 a year also need affordable accommodation they can rent, so perhaps some of these flats could be bought by either the City Council or Housing Associations in order to facilitate this.

The amount of space being given over to studio and workshop space is good for the arts community. The workshop space could easily be used by local artists while the studio space could be used as rehearsal space for local amateur dramatics groups, dance organisations and also any local visual arts in general, so perhaps a home could be offered on this huge site to Peacock Visual Arts. It is also a prime city centre location which, along with other attractions would attract footfall and therefore paying business to this organisation as well.

If Aberdeen is to become a vibrant city in the future, it needs to embrace its art community, not alienate it. If you go to London's West End, it is a busy, vibrant place. This development could help bring the vibrancy that is being sought after by local businesses. The creative industries need to be given a chance to flourish and could contribute to Aberdeen's economy in the long run just as these industries do in Dundee. If the city embraces its local arts community by allowing them to use the studio space this development proposes to provide, it will help Aberdeen's economy to diversify. Most importantly, the local arts community can make money that will stay in Aberdeen and not go south like the profits of the big retail chains that most developers in the past do. If Aberdeen stays entrenched in the energy industry and that industry goes busy in the future, then the city will turn into a ghost town, which is why it must diversify so that areas such as tourism and the arts will help keep the city afloat along with energy.

On the whole, this development has the potential to be the start of the diversification of Aberdeen's local economy and therefore should be embraced. It would also mean that the site is no longer a mecca for undesirables but can be enjoyed by everyone and future generations. Please don't throw away the opportunity Broadford Works represents. It could be the development that makes the city centre attractive again and gets people coming into it for a long time to come.